

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

LOWELL L. HAWKINS, :  
Plaintiff, : Case No. 3:07cv242  
vs. : JUDGE WALTER HERBERT RICE  
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, :  
Defendant. :  
\_\_\_\_\_

DECISION AND ENTRY REJECTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE (DOC. #11) IN THEIR  
ENTIRETY; PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO SAID JUDICIAL FILING  
(DOC. #12) SUSTAINED; JUDGMENT TO ENTER IN FAVOR OF  
PLAINTIFF AND AGAINST DEFENDANT COMMISSIONER, VACATING  
THE COMMISSIONER'S DECISION THAT PLAINTIFF WAS NOT DISABLED  
AND, THEREFORE, NOT ENTITLED TO BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL  
SECURITY ACT, AND REMANDING THE CAPTIONED CAUSE TO THE  
DEFENDANT COMMISSIONER, PURSUANT TO SENTENCE FOUR OF 42  
U.S.C. § 405(g), FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION PURSUANT TO THIS  
COURT'S OPINION; TERMINATION ENTRY  
\_\_\_\_\_

Plaintiff has brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to review a decision of the Defendant Commissioner denying Plaintiff's application for Social Security disability benefits. On June 6, 2008, the United States Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendations (Doc. #11), recommending that the Commissioner's decision that Plaintiff was not disabled and, therefore, not entitled to benefits under the Social Security Act be affirmed. Based upon reasoning and

citations of authority set forth in the Plaintiff's Objections to said judicial filing (Doc. #12) and in the Plaintiff's Statement of Specific Errors (Doc. #8), as well as upon a thorough de novo review of this Court's file, including both the Administrative Transcript (filed with Defendant's Answer at Doc. #6), and a review of the pertinent medical evidence related to Plaintiff's two prior applications, contained in the Magistrate Judge's February 9, 2004, Report and Recommendations, as well as a thorough review of the applicable law, this Court rejects the aforesaid Report and Recommendations in their entirety and, in so doing, orders the entry of judgment in favor of the Plaintiff and against the Defendant Commissioner, concluding that the Commissioner's decision that Plaintiff was not disabled and, therefore, not entitled to benefits under the Social Security Act was not supported by substantial evidence; vacating the decision of non-disability; making no finding as to whether the Plaintiff was under a disability for the closed period at issue; and remanding the captioned cause to the Defendant Commissioner, pursuant to the Fourth Sentence of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), for further proceedings and consideration consistent with this Opinion. Accordingly, said decision is vacated.

In reviewing the Commissioner's decision, the Magistrate's task is to determine if that decision is supported by "substantial evidence." 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court, upon objections being made to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations, is required to make a de novo review of those recommendations of the report to which objection is made.

This de novo review, in turn, requires this Court to re-examine all the relevant evidence, previously reviewed by the Magistrate, to determine whether the findings of the Secretary [now Commissioner] are supported by "substantial evidence."

Lashley v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 708 F.2d 1048, 1053 (6th Cir. 1983); Gibson v. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, 678 F.2d 653, 654 (6th Cir. 1982). This Court's sole function is to determine whether the record as a whole contains substantial evidence to support the Commissioner's decision. The Commissioner's findings must be affirmed if they are supported by "such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."

Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971), citing Consolidated Edison Company v. NLRB, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938); Landsaw v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 803 F.2d 211, 213 (6th Cir. 1986). Substantial evidence means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. Richardson, supra, at 401; Ellis v. Schweicker, 739 F.2d 245, 248 (6th Cir. 1984). Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla, but only so much as would be required to prevent a directed verdict (now judgment as a matter of law) against the Commissioner if this case were being tried to a jury. Foster v. Bowen, 853 F.2d 483, 486 (6th Cir. 1988); NLRB v. Columbian Enameling and Stamping Company, 306 U.S. 292, 300 (1939). To be substantial, the evidence "must do more than create a suspicion of the existence of the fact to be established... [I]t must be enough to justify, if the trial were to a jury, a refusal to direct a verdict

when the conclusion sought to be drawn from it is one of fact for the jury."

LeMaster v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 802 F.2d 839, 840 (6th Cir. 1986), quoting NLRB v. Columbian Enameling and Stamping Company, supra.

In determining whether the Commissioner's findings are supported by substantial evidence, the Court must consider the record as a whole. Hephner v. Mathews, 574 F.2d 359 (6th Cir. 1978); Ellis, supra; Kirk v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 667 F.2d 524, 536 (6th Cir. 1981); Houston v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 736 F.2d 365 (6th Cir. 1984); Garner v. Heckler, 745 F.2d 383 (6th Cir. 1984). However, the Court may not try the case de novo, resolve conflicts in evidence or decide questions of credibility. Garner, supra. The findings of the Commissioner of Social Security and proceedings on Claimant's application for social security disability benefits are not subject to reversal merely because there exists in the record substantial evidence to support a different conclusion. Buxton v. Halter, Commissioner of Social Security, 246 F.3d 762 (6th Cir. 2001). If the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence, it must be affirmed, even if the Court as a trier of fact would have arrived at a different conclusion. Elkins v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 658 F.2d 437, 439 (6th Cir. 1981).

In addition to the foregoing, in ruling as aforesaid, this Court makes the following, non-exclusive, observations:

1. This Court believes that the Administrative Law Judge, and hence the Magistrate Judge, erred by applying Drummond v. Commissioner of Social Security, 126 F.3d 837 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) to the facts of this case, given that there was new and material evidence, documenting a change for the worse in Plaintiff's condition, for the closed period from June 29, 2002, and prior to the expiration of his insured status on September 30, 2002, to wit: left hip and knee, together with treatment notes from the Veterans Administration Medical Center, containing reports of objective medical tests, revealing degenerative changes in Plaintiff's left hip and arthritic changes in his left knee; and the psychological examination performed by Dr. Richard Bomberg in September 9, 2002, containing, *inter alia*, the results of psychological testing.

WHEREFORE, based upon the aforesaid, this Court rejects the Report and Recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge (Doc. #11) in their entirety, having concluded that the Commissioner's decision that Plaintiff was not disabled and, therefore, not entitled to benefits under the Social Security Act was not supported by substantial evidence. Plaintiff's Objections to said judicial filing (Doc. #12) are sustained. Judgment will be ordered entered in favor of the Plaintiff and against Defendant Commissioner, vacating the decision of the Defendant Commissioner; making no finding on the issue of Plaintiff's disability and, thus, entitlement to benefits under the Social Security Act; and remanding the captioned

cause to the Defendant Commissioner, pursuant to the Fourth Sentence of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), for thorough consideration of the evidence referenced above and any and all other evidence necessary to determine the Plaintiff's entitlement to benefits for the closed period between June 29, 2002, through the expiration of his insured status on September 30, 2002.

The captioned cause is hereby ordered terminated upon the docket records of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, at Dayton.

September 24, 2008

/s/ Walter Herbert Rice  
WALTER HERBERT RICE, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Copies to:

Gary M. Blumenthal, Esq.  
John J. Stark, Esq.  
Kathryn A. Beverly, Esq.